

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I would urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can save some money here and prevent this massive raid on the Medicare trust fund that is coming in in this SCHIP bill.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, is there a particular parliamentary vehicle that, once an amendment has been accepted by the majority, that the amendment can then be disposed of?

I don't know what the point is here. We've accepted the amendment. It's been asked. It's been answered. We accept it. We want to add it to the bill. We're prepared to move forward. We've accepted the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the amendment after 5-minute debate has been exhausted.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chairman, I also rise in support of the McHenry amendment. Clearly, we have to get some control over spending, and this Agriculture bill is no exception to this.

As we look at this spending bill, as we've looked at the rest of them, we're continuing to spend more money, and it's a recipe for further tax increases. Furthermore, it's going to be at the expense of seniors. Here we are, we're looking at an SCHIP bill which, in my opinion, after looking at this to the extent I've been able to look at it, appears to be very irresponsibly crafted. In fact, I believe it to be a cruel hoax.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order, Madam Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chair, as I understand previous rulings from the Chair, that the gentleman must confine his remarks to the matter at hand, the Agriculture appropriations bill, and not the SCHIP bill, which will come before the Congress later this week.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana must confine his remarks to the pending question.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the Chair.

As I was saying, this bill continues to spend far too much money, as did all the previous appropriations bills we've voted upon, and it is going to put fur-

ther pressure on the work that we desperately need to do.

Looking at what we're going to go forward with as we look at health care, how are we going to pay for health care if we're putting all this money into overspending in these other bills? We have to get our priorities straight.

If we're going to raise cigarette taxes, a diminishing source of revenue, to pay for a program that's expanding, and then we're also going to take one-time money from Medicare Advantage to pay for an expanded program, how is it that we're going to deal with our entire Federal budget? Again, this bill before us today is a big part of the problem.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have sat here and have counted 15 straight times that we have ruled on the central question of germaneness. We are here to talk about the Agriculture appropriations.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have a point of order?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. My point of order is, where is it in the rules to which this total disrespect for the Chair and the rulings of the Chair continues to be allowed? What is the point of having a rule?

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chair, point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. May I have my point of order responded to?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair has already ruled, the gentleman from Louisiana must confine his remarks to the pending question.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia may state his point of order.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, is it not true that we are talking about a spending bill—

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman stating a point of order or parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GINGREY. The point of order, Madam Chairman, is, if there is spending and language in this bill that pertains to drugs, that pertains to health care, that pertains to the FDA and drug reimportation, then that makes this discussion of spending germane to the overall bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled.

The gentleman from Louisiana must maintain an ongoing nexus between the pending question and any broader policy issues.

The gentleman from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, I just want to say

that we're talking about an Agriculture bill, a spending bill, and we're talking about money that is going to be spent. We're talking about money that is going to be spent in this that will not be available to spend on health care issues, particularly on a number of issues affecting rural seniors.

Now, I have a rural district, it depends on agriculture, and as we go forward, we're going to hurt these seniors in these rural communities. If we cut over \$200 billion in Medicare spending, I have 3,246 seniors in the Seventh Congressional District who are currently enrolled in the Medicare Advantage who are going to suffer. So I think we have to get our priorities straight as we go forward.

Furthermore, as we look at payments for hospitals are being cut \$2.7 billion; in-patient rehabilitative services, \$6.6 billion in cuts; payments for skilled nursing facilities, \$6.5 billion in cuts; payments for certain drugs, \$1.9 billion; in-State renal disease, \$3.6 billion. These are seniors who are poor in my Seventh Congressional District, and because of the spending in this Agriculture bill, they can't take care of these problems.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. DELAURO. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will state her point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. It has been ruled over and over again on this floor that the gentleman has to keep his remarks in the context of the bill, the Agriculture appropriations bill that is being discussed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana must confine his remarks to the pending question.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the Chairwoman.

Again, I state that I am supporting the McHenry amendment because I think it's an important step forward as we get some control over spending so we can set our priorities straight so we don't hurt rural seniors.

I pointed out the numerous cuts that are going to be made to the 3,246 seniors in the Seventh Congressional District alone.

Madam Chair, when is the spending spree going to stop? When are we going to get control over this spending so that we can set our priorities straight?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, we have been debating this amendment for 1 hour. We accepted this amendment within that 1 hour.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have a point of order?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, how many times can our friends on the other side of the aisle raise non-germane issues after the Chair has ruled that they must confine their remarks to the underlying bill?